Recommendations for Developing a Process to Prioritize and Evaluate Performance-based Pay Raise Requests

Justin Hancock

South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism

Submission Date: February 6, 2017

South Carolina
Just right.

Problem Statement

The breadth of diverse professional activities conducted by staff at the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism (SCPRT) creates significant challenges for agency leadership in making equitable and objective decisions regarding requests for performance-based pay increases. SCPRT is comprised of three distinct divisions – Tourism Marketing, State Parks, and the SC Film Office – as well as executive and administrative support divisions for agency management, human resources management, finance and technology services. In addition to the agency's "field positions" for State Parks and the state's Welcome Center program, the types of positions within the agency central office range widely from public relations specialists and advertising sales managers to construction engineers and biologists. Due to this diversity of positions, comparatively evaluating performance measurements to determine priority and individual amounts for performance-based pay increases either across or within agency divisions can be extremely problematic and, often, controversial.

This difficulty is further compounded by the Employee Performance Management System (EPMS)-based performance review system utilized by South Carolina state government agencies, which has been identified as a contributing factor to salary disparities between state agencies in the *State of South Carolina: Classification and Compensation System Study Project Report* prepared by Kenning Consulting. Based on interviews conducted with agency and human resources leadership from several state agencies, the report determined that, due to inconsistent approaches to pay increases, "the statewide performance management process (EPMS) is not viewed as effective for

managing performance and/or as a link between performance and pay" (Neville Kenning, 2016, p. 15).

While the Kenning study primarily discussed salary disparity between agencies, salary disparities can also exist between different divisions within an agency. These disparities, either real or perceived, combined with staff perceptions of unmitigated subjectivity in compensation decisions can lead to increasing employee dissatisfaction, ultimately yielding an unmotivated workforce and negatively affecting agency operations and progress toward agency goals.

Currently, SCPRT has no systematic approach to prioritizing or evaluating performance increase requests other than simply directly comparing EPMS review results and ranking them against the amount of budget available for pay increases. The wide variance of positions and corresponding areas of responsibility, combined with potentially subjective EPMS criteria and possible disparity of appraisal practices by supervisors render the current agency approach to compensation increase requests fundamentally arbitrary. This research project seeks to develop recommendations for a systematic process for prioritizing and evaluating performance-based pay increase requests that can be applied throughout all agency divisions and that relies either exclusively or primarily on objective criteria and information about the employee.

Data Collection

The data collected for this research project will be used to achieve several goals:

1) Research current, applicable practices in employee performance pay compensation, including research regarding employee performance evaluation systems;

2) Determine feasibility and any legal or procedural parameters that may restrict or cause variations in potential processes development;
3) Align project recommendations with key findings and recommendations from the Kenning study.

Data utilized to develop a proposed performance-based pay raise review process will include legal regulations and current policy governing employee compensation practices; topline, relevant recommendations from the Kenning study and research regarding employee performance-based compensation practices. Internal agency data, including salary averages for positions with a relatively high volume of FTEs as well as any other factors that may impact the process development will also be used. I will also use external data, including state level occupation data from the SC Department of Employee and Workforce (SCDEW) for comparable positions within the agency. No individual salary amount, including those made publicly available through the SC Department of Administration website, or past or current compensation increase requests will be included or discussed in this research proposal. In addition, this research proposal will not identify current salaries for positions held by one or only a small number of individuals within the agency.

Data Analysis

There have been considerable amounts of academic and professional research conducted on the topics of employee performance evaluations and performance-based

compensation[1]. James L. Perry notes in his article on possible causes of the failure of merit pay in the public sector that one of the first and most well-known theories concerning performance-based pay was developed by Edward Lawler, who based his theory on Victor Vroom's Expectancy Theory[2] and concluded that "because pay can be an attractive reward, it is assumed to motivate members' actions more effectively if it is made contingent on those actions" (Perry, 1986, p. 59). Perry's article, as well as many others, cite a variety of potential causes for the ineffectiveness or failure of performance or merit pay systems in the public sector. Some researchers have suggested that merit or performance pay creates too much focus on extrinsic motivation, often to the detriment of public sector employees' intrinsic motivations. In his article, Perry suggests that merit pay failure could possibly result from consequential factors such as the formation of elaborate and onerous control systems to measure service productivity or strained professional relationships between managers and employees (Perry, 1986, pp. 60-66).

In an article on the impact of civil service reform on performance appraisal justice, the author, Jungin Kim, provides an extensive literature review of research studies on pay-for-performance ineffectiveness (Kim J., 2016, pp. 150-154). The possible causes for ineffectiveness of a performance pay system include unclear or ambiguous performance criteria, perceived politicization of the appraisal process, and an unclear performance-pay link – all of which, Kim notes, give rise to employee perceptions of lack of appraisal justice. This is also central to the hypotheses developed by Taehee Kim and Marc Holzer in their

[1] Since this project concerns process development for a state government agency, the articles most germane to this project are those that focus exclusively on employees in the public sector.
[2] Vroom's Expectancy Theory of Motivation contends that individuals will behave or act in a certain way because they are motivated to select a specific behavior over others based on what they expect the result of that specific behavior will be and if they value that result. (Wikipedia, 2017)

research on public employees and performance appraisals. Specifically, Kim and Holzer examine correlations between various appraisal factors and employee perceptions of procedural and distributive justice[3] in performance appraisal systems.

No matter the underlying cause identified in many of these and similar research papers, employee perception of fairness and justice in the performance review process and equitability in the associated performance-pay determinations is a central and recurring key factor in determining the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of a performance or merit pay system. From this information, it may be fairly concluded that expectancy-based performance-pay systems often, inherently and unintentionally, neglect the hygiene factors that Frederick Herzberg argued in his Two-Factor Theory[4] were necessary for job satisfaction. In other words, performance-pay systems that are constructed to focus exclusively on employee motivation, often neglect and negatively impact employee satisfaction. Thus, it may be posited that an effective performance-pay system should, at the least, strive to balance employee motivation and satisfaction.

There are very few South Carolina state laws governing performance-based salary increases, offering minimal standards and procedural guidelines and, instead, allowing state agencies the discretion to develop their own policies and procedures for this process. Section 8-1-160 of the South Carolina Code of Laws states that "Notwithstanding other provisions of law, state agencies may increase or decrease individual employee salaries

---

[3] "Procedural justice refers to whether the performance appraisal is perceived as procedurally fair and valid, whereas distributive justice refers to whether the amount of rewards for good performance is equitable" ((Kim & Holzer, 2016, p. 35).

[4] Herzberg's Two Factor Theory is a motivation theory that contends that employee attitudes and behaviors are influenced by both Motivation Factors (Achievement, Recognition, Responsibility, Interest, Advancement, and Growth) and Hygiene Factors (Working Conditions, Quality of Supervision, Salary, Status, Security, Company, Job, Company Policies and Administration, Interpersonal Relations) (Two Factor Theory, 2016).

based upon performance. Such increase or decrease shall be determined by the agency. Performance increases shall not place an employee's salary above the maximum of the grade or executive compensation level" (SC Code of Laws, n.d.). Similarly, South Carolina Code of Regulations §19-705.04 states "Agencies shall develop written policies to govern the administration of salary increases for employees," and that agencies shall also maintain written justification for awarding an in band salary increase. The specific criteria for a performance-based salary increase mirrors the language found within the Code of Laws (SC Code of Regulations, n.d.).

Current SCPRT Department Policy 700.09[5] "Performance Pay Increases" states that agency policy is intended to achieve the following:

- Improve job performance and productivity
- Reward exceptional employee contributions to the objectives of the Agency
- Reward employees who have contributed to cost savings, cost reduction, or cost containment of the Agency.

The policy provides a procedural outline for submitting a performance pay increase, stipulating that justification must be based on the following criteria:

- Current, successful EPMS evaluation (mandatory)
- Demonstrated positive attitude and spirit of service and cooperation
- Substantial contribution to the objectives of the Agency through the performance of special assignments or the provision of exceptional customer service
- Significant increase in service or productivity.

The policy does not assign specific values or measures for the second, third or fourth justification criteria, nor does it offer guidance on how these criteria should be evaluated.

[5] See Appendix 1

While the first criteria, arguably, offers a quantitative measure of an employee's performance, the other three criteria necessitate varying degrees of subjectivity. Moreover, these three criteria also offer no points of comparison to prioritize pay increase requests, which must also be done either subjectively or based exclusively on EPMS evaluation scores.

Market-based occupation and compensation comparisons comprise a significant focus of the Kenning study and are attributed to such ongoing issues as salary disparity, internal inequity, and difficulties in employee recruitment and retention. Among the key findings, the Kenning study identified a questionable link between existing salary bands and the external market, and further cited agency uncertainty regarding targeted market policy position, indicating that employee positions and compensations are likely misaligned with current job market trends or conditions. One key opportunity for improvement, as identified in the study's interviews, was to "develop market based pay ranges and move pay ranges in line with market movement, not just move them when there is a general increase" (Neville Kenning, 2016, p. 16).

Given the number of classified FTE positions and amount of state funds allocated for personnel services, normalizing existing State Employee positions and compensation levels with current job market trends would likely face budgetary limitations if attempted in only a few fiscal cycles. Conversely, a long-term approach may alleviate fiscal difficulties, but would encounter challenges in responding to constant changes within the occupation marketplace without a mechanism to adapt to and methodically incorporate those changes into an ongoing normalization process.

Provided the data is readily available, updated periodically and relevant or relatable to existing positions within the agency, incorporating marketplace compensation data into performance-based pay procedures may serve to provide such a vehicle for compensation normalization while also providing an objective criterion that can be factored into evaluation and prioritization of requests.

The SCDEW website contains both historic and current occupation data, including occupation titles, descriptions, and median salaries. For the purpose of this research project, occupation titles and their corresponding median annual wage were selected based on similarity or relevancy to existing positions at SCPRT. Although not exhaustive, this list[6] represents the majority of positions within the agency divisions located in the central office and, overall, correlated well with the positions within these divisions. Forty-five of the fifty-five identified occupation titles correlated to positions within one or more division in SCPRT's central office.

While the SCDEW occupation data paralleled well with positions within SCPRT's central office divisions, the occupation titles most similar to Welcome Center and State Parks field positions often had only one attribute similar to positions within those field divisions of the agency. For example, "Park Naturalist" is the only occupation title listing similar to the positions of Park Ranger I and II and Park Manager I, II, and III, which would mean only one occupation median salary ($49,770) could be compared against five distinct agency positions, with average salaries ranging from $23,000 to $52,000. In addition, the attributes of the Park Naturalist occupation do not sufficiently correlate to the customer service aspects associated with many of these positions, especially dependent upon the

[6] See Appendix 2

specific park location of a Park Ranger. For example, a Park Ranger I at a rural State Park location that does not offer overnight accommodations, such as Woods Bay State Park in Olanta, would be more similar to the Park Naturalist occupation, whereas a Park Ranger I at a more urban park location, such as Paris Mountain State Park, located near Greenville and offering group lodging, would have several position responsibilities outside the traditional scope of this occupation title. In the case of Welcome Center positions, several occupation title listings, such as Information Clerks, Concierges, and Travel Agents, were found that contain some aspect of either a Travel Coordinator or Welcome Center Manager position, but no listings were found that matched a majority of the work functions or responsibilities of these agency positions. In addition, the median salaries of these occupation titles, ranging from $20,000 to $32,000, did not correlate well with average salaries for the Travel Coordinator I and II, and the Tourism Manager positions, which ranged from $24,000 to $40,000.

The potential reason for insufficient market correlations and the factor that both the Welcome Center positions and the State Parks Ranger positions have in common is that they may both represent occupations and work functions that occur almost exclusively within the public sector. In this case, factoring in salary equity may require a different approach for State Parks field and Welcome Center positions. It should be noted that this falls in line with another key finding from the Kenning study, which suggested that the State "move away from one pay structure for classified employees to having structures that reflect the fact that the market is different for different occupations" (Neville Kenning, 2016, p. 16).

Based on the findings of the Kenning study and conclusions of academic and professional research on pay-performance system effectiveness, this project proposes that SCPRT implement a system in which performance-based pay increase prioritization[7] and evaluation are divided into two distinct procedures – both of which would incorporate market-based salary comparison as a key determination factor.

Utilizing a comparative ratio (compa-ratio) between an SCPRT employee's current salary and the median salary for a correlating occupation title would provide one objective criterion that could be used either for pay increase request evaluation or prioritization. For prioritization, the compa-ratio could be factored in with another objective criterion, such as time since last pay adjustment[8]. The examples below assume a required minimum three year span between pay adjustments for performance-based pay increases.

$$\text{Prioritization Score} = \frac{\text{(Time since Pay Adjustment} - 2)}{\text{Compa-ratio}}$$

Example One: Two employees have pay raise requests; however, there is only sufficient budget to fund one request. Employee A has a compa-ratio of 110% and received a pay raise 6 years ago. Employee B has a compa-ratio of 50% and received a pay increase through promotion 4 years ago.

Employee A: (6-2)/1.10 = 3.64 Prioritization Score
Employee B: (4-2)/.5 = 4.00 Prioritization Score

Although Employee B received a pay adjustment more recently than Employee A, the disparity between Employee B's salary and the median salary for the occupation yielded a higher prioritization score for Employee B.

[7] Prioritization need only occur in the case of insufficient budget to cover all eligible performance-based pay increase requests.
[8] This would cover any pay adjustment action on an employee's salary except cost of living increases through general appropriations.

Example Two: Employee C has a compa-ratio of 85% and received a pay increase 5 years ago. Employee D has a compa-ratio of 125% and received a pay increase through acquisition of additional duties 5 years ago.

Employee C: (5-2)/.85 = 3.5 Prioritization Score
Employee D: (5-2)/1.25 = 2.4 Prioritization Score

In this scenario, both employees have an equal time span since last pay adjustment, so the determining factor is the compa-ratio. Employee C would receive a higher Prioritization Score based on a salary level that is below market level.

As mentioned previously, no sufficiently correlating in-state market data could be found for Welcome Center and State Parks ranger positions. While it is, of course, possible to compare these positions' salaries with salary data from government agencies in other states, it would likely be difficult to ensure equivalency of occupations between two agencies belonging to different governments. For example, in comparing organizational structures of South Carolina's Welcome Center program with similar programs in other southeastern states, it was determined that there was no equivalent position for SCPRT's Travel Coordinator II position in seven out of the ten states surveyed. Moreover, salaries from similar occupations in other states may have to be adjusted to account for cost-of-living differences.

In lieu of in-state occupational market comparisons or out-of-state position comparisons, each employee's salary could be compared against the median salary of the functional range for that position, yielding a position-in-range that would essentially function that same as a compa-ratio.

For the purpose of evaluation, a salary matrix with assigned pay increase values could be used, incorporating the compa-ratio (or position-in-range) with either an

employee's EPMS rating, or – more preferably – a specific, quantitative SMART[9] goal derived from the employee's position responsibilities, incorporated into the annual review process and corresponding to an agency goal, strategy or objective. The table below, essentially a salary matrix, illustrates how these two factors could be used to determine pay increase amount.

	Compa-Ratio <0.9	Compa-Ratio 0.9 – 1.1	Compa-Ratio >1.1
High Goal Achievement	10%	9%	8%
Median Goal Achievement	8%	7%	6%
Low Goal Achievement	6%	5%	4%

Assigning a specific SMART goal for each employee and utilizing the measurement of this goal could serve to reduce perceived subjectivity or unfairness in the performance pay increase decision process. The assigned SMART goals for employees should provide a quantitative, objective measure of an existing work function productivity or activity that is central to the employee's position within the agency. SMART goals may be applied to entire groups, in the case of shared work functions and goals, or they may be unique to an individual employee. SCPRT's Welcome Center program and State Parks Division offer examples of instances where SMART goals can be applied to entire groups of employees. One activity currently measured and evaluated in each Welcome Center employee's annual EPMS review is reservation assistance. Each time a Welcome Center employee provides direct reservation assistance to a Welcome Center visitor, this assistance is logged in that employee's personnel file. During the employee's performance appraisal, the number of

[9] SMART is an acronym used for goal setting in project management and performance appraisal. While there are several variations for the meaning of each letter, the following offers common interpretations: S – Specific; M – Measurable; A – Agreed Upon or Attainable; R – Relevant; T – Timely or Time Sensitive.

times reservation assistance has been provided is evaluated and compared to previous year totals. The number of times reservation assistance is provided is a quantitative measure that could be used as an assigned SMART goal for all Welcome Center employees. Or, in order to mitigate variations in visitor volumes between locations and provide a normalized range for goal setting throughout the Welcome Center program, a reservation assistance conversion rate could be used instead.

For the State Parks field positions, revenue increases, expenditure decreases, or improved operational self-sufficiency could potentially serve as SMART goals that may be used throughout the entire State Parks system. Since revenue and expenditures vary widely throughout the system[10], each State Park's financial performance trends could be used to determine and, when necessary adjust, performance goal levels. As with any other SMART goal, improvement would have to be directly attributable to employee actions and not the result of overtly external factors, such as rate increases. Utilizing financial goals for the State Parks system may also be the most appropriate measure for State Parks field positions since State Parks receive very little in recurring appropriations and are almost exclusively funded through Other Funds, specifically State Parks revenue.

Employees in the agency central office would, most likely, be assigned unique, individual SMART goals based on their work responsibilities. Each division's director could work with their staff and staff from the agency's Human Resource Management office to determine appropriate individual SMART goals. SMART goals that create burdensome, additional work to measure should be avoided. Although the practice should be

[10] See Appendix 3

discouraged, in the case of an employee who has no work functions that yield quantifiable results, total EPMS score could be used in lieu of a specific SMART goal.

Implementation Plan

In order to implement this proposed process for performance-based pay increase request evaluation, SCPRT's Human Resources Office would have to work with each agency division to identify correlating in-state market occupations for division staff and develop SMART goals for employees within each division. Agency leadership would provide final approval for these decisions. Although not specifically required, it would be prudent to also seek approval from the Department of Administration State Human Resources Division. Since the assigned SMART goal would be included in the EPMS process in order to provide a mechanism for the employee to provide input and consent to the goal, this could only be implemented following an EPMS annual review.

Costs to implement this type of program could be relatively low; however, the initial set-up for this process would be time consuming, lasting – most likely – at least one year. Prior to implementation, the agency should run an extensive series of hypothetical scenarios against these processes to identify any potential complications that may occur. Other than staff time, the only predictable potential costs are those that would be incurred if the agency sought outside consulting help to establish the process, or determined the need to purchase occupational data. As a precaution, SCPRT should consult with appropriate staff from SCDEW to determine the accuracy and timeliness of the occupational data found on their website, and also the frequency with which this data is updated. Potential obstacles may include resistance by staff to this change in procedure

and, following implementation, manipulation of data for assigned SMART goals. In order for these processes to work effectively and alleviate complications and concerns that arise from relying exclusively on EPMS scores, there must be buy-in from key stakeholders within the agency, especially the division directors. These stakeholders should be consulted and provided the opportunity for comment before any aspects of this project are implemented.

Evaluation Method

The primary measure of success for this project would be the degree to which its processes are viewed as fair and objective. If implemented, these processes could be evaluated through employee satisfaction surveys, specifically for requesting managers, regarding the performance-based pay review process. Since implementation would take at least a year, similar surveys could be sent out prior to implementation to establish a baseline to measure against in subsequent years after implementation.

Summary and Recommendations

Eliminating EPMS from the performance-based pay increase process, especially the prioritization process, and incorporating market-based salary comparisons could significantly improve employee perceptions of fairness and objectivity concerning these processes and the decisions they yield. If implemented successfully, these process improvements may increase employee motivation without compromising employee satisfaction. In addition, over the long term, these processes may serve to alleviate salary inequity between agency positions and the in-state occupational market, or any market-

relative salary disparities that exist between agency divisions. As a next step, feasibility of the process should be determined by compiling a complete list of in-state market occupation listings and potential SMART goals and then running an extensive series of hypothetical scenarios in order to test these processes and provide a clear understanding of how well they may function for the agency and what, if any, adjustments to the processes should be made.

Bibliography

Kim, J. (2016). Impact of Performance Appraisal Justice on the Effectiveness of Pay-for-Performance Systems After Civil Service Reform. *Public Personnel Management*, 148-170.

Kim, T., & Holzer, M. (2016). Public Employees and Performance Appraisal: A Study of Antecedents to Employees' Perception of the Process. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31-56.

Neville Kenning. (2016). *State of South Carolina: Classification and Compensation System Study Project Report.* Newport Beach: Kenning Consulting.

Perry, J. L. (1986). Merit Pay in the Public Sector: The Case for a Failure of Theory. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 57-69.

SC Code of Laws. (n.d.). Retrieved from South Carolina Legislature: http://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=8%201%20160&category=CODEOFLAWS&conid=8419872&result_pos=0&keyval=6069&numrows=10

SC Code of Regulations. (n.d.). Retrieved from South Carolina Legislature: http://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=19%20705.04&category=CODEOFREGS&conid=8419879&result_pos=0&keyval=14&numrows=10

Two Factor Theory. (2016, January 6). Retrieved from Value Based Management: http://www.valuebasedmanagement.net/methods_herzberg_two_factor_theory.html

Wikipedia. (2017). *Expectancy Theory.* Retrieved from Wikipedia: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expectancy_theory

Appendix 1: SCPRT Department Policy 700.09 "Performance Pay Increases"

South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism **DEPARTMENT POLICY**	Policy Number: 700.09	Page Number: 1
	Effective Date: 07 01 2004	
	Supercedes: 700.09	Dated: 10 01 2003
Subject: PERFORMANCE PAY INCREASES		

THE LANGUAGE USED IN THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT CREATE ANY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT BETWEEN THE EMPLOYEE AND THE S. C. DEPARTMENT OF PARKS, RECREATION & TOURISM. THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT CREATE ANY CONTRACTUAL RIGHTS OR ENTITLEMENTS. NO PAST PRACTICES OR PROCEDURES, WHETHER ORAL OR WRITTEN, FORM ANY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED AGREEMENT TO CONTINUE SUCH PRACTICES OR PROCEDURES. SCPRT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVISE THE CONTENT OF THIS DOCUMENT, IN WHOLE OR IN PART. NO PROMISES OR ASSURANCES, WHETHER WRITTEN OR ORAL, WHICH ARE CONTRARY TO OR INCONSISTENT WITH THE TERMS OF THIS PARAGRAPH CREATE ANY CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT.

This policy is in accordance with State Human Resources Regulation 19-702.05 B.2.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

In accordance with Section 8-1-160 of the State Government Accountability and Reform Act of 1993, the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism (PRT) has the authority to award increases to classified employees who make exceptional contributions to the agency.

The Performance Pay Increase Policy for classified staff is intended to:

- Improve job performance and productivity
- Reward exceptional employee contributions to the objectives of the Agency
- Reward employees who have contributed to cost savings, cost reduction, or cost containment of the Agency.

PROCEDURES

Requesting Authority: Supervisors should submit requests and justification for awarding a Performance Pay Increase through the appropriate chain of command. After authorization by the Office Director, the requests should be forwarded to the Human Resource Management Office.

Documentation: Each request for a Performance Pay Increase must be documented on Request for Performance Pay Approval Form (attached) and must be based on the most recent EPMS.

APPROVED _____ DATE JULY 1, 2004
DIRECTOR

(Rev 1-94)

South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism **DEPARTMENT POLICY**	Policy Number 700.09	Page Number 2
	Effective Date: 07 01 2004	
	Supercedes: 700.09	Dated: 10 01 2003
Subject: PERFORMANCE PAY INCREASES		

Justification: The rationale must be based on the following criteria. one of which is mandatory:

- Current. successful EPMS evaluation (mandatory)
- Demonstrated positive attitude and spirit of service and cooperation
- Substantial contribution to the objectives of the Agency through the performance of special assignments or the provision of exceptional customer service
- Significant increase in service or productivity.

Range Limits: Performance Pay Increases. as determined by the agency. may be awarded provided the increase does not place the employee's salary above the maximum of the pay range of the position.

Funding of Performance Increases: Increases will be paid from the Agency's operating budget. Certification that the Office has funds available is declared by the signing of the Division Director.

Approval Authority: Performance Pay Increases must be approved by Human Resource Management Office and the Directorate.

APPROVED _____ DATE JULY 1, 2004

DIRECTOR

(Rev. 1-94)

Appendix 2: In-state Occupational Market Titles, Median Salaries, and Correlating SCPRT Divisions

Marketplace Occupation Title	Median Annual Wage	Relevant Agency Divisions
Secretaries and Administrative Assistants	$30,140	All
First Line Supervisors of Office and Administrative Support Workers	$45,660	All
Executive Secretaries and Executive Administrative Assistants	$45,580	Directorate
Business Operations Specialists, All Other	$62,920	Film, State Parks - CO
Management Analysts	$81,320	Film, State Parks - CO
Payroll and Time Keeping Clerks	$37,760	Finance
Financial Analysts	$63,370	Finance
Accountants	$56,030	Finance
Financial Managers, Branch or Department	$98,760	Finance
Auditors	$56,030	Finance, Film
Budget Analysts	$55,660	Finance, State Parks - CO
Human Resources Assistants	$31,070	Human Resource Management
Compensation, Benefits, and Job Analysis Specialists	$46,910	Human Resource Management
Human Resource Managers	$87,910	Human Resource Management
Human Resource Specialists	$49,940	Human Resource Management
Labor Relations Specialists	$53,490	Human Resource Management
Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists	$54,360	Research
Economists	$58,770	Research
Statisticians	$80,110	Research
Civil Engineers	$72,630	State Parks - CO
Construction Managers	$81,000	State Parks - CO
General and Operations Managers	$78,950	State Parks - CO
Biologists	$58,440	State Parks - CO
Biological Technicians	$39,020	State Parks - CO
Historians	$58,440	State Parks - CO
Archeologists	$61,220	State Parks - CO
Foresters	$60,220	State Parks - CO
Forest and Conservation Technicians	$38,130	State Parks - CO
Receptionists and Information Clerks	$26,020	State Parks - Field
Park Naturalists	$49,770	State Parks - Field
Recreation Workers	$21,460	State Parks - Field
Lodging Managers	$49,720	State Parks - Field (Limited)
First Line Supervisors Food Preparation and Serving Workers	$27,660	State Parks - Field (Limited)
Web Developers	$54,520	Technology Services
Information Technology Project Managers	$80,150	Technology Services
Computer Programmers	$67,610	Technology Services
Computer Systems Analysts	$71,800	Technology Services
Computer Network Architects	$88,240	Technology Services
Computer Systems Engineers/Architects	$80,150	Technology Services
Information Security Analysts	$68,580	Technology Services
Database Administrators	$66,370	Technology Services

Computer User Support Specialists	$43,450	Technology Services
Web Administrators	$80,150	Technology Services, Tourism Marketing
Marketing Manager	$97,730	Tourism Marketing
Advertising Sales Agents	$39,220	Tourism Marketing
Public Relations Specialists	$45,290	Tourism Marketing
Advertising and Promotion Managers	$68,780	Tourism Marketing
Copy Writers	$50,750	Tourism Marketing
Meeting, Convention and Event Planners	$46,840	Tourism Marketing
Travel Agents	$26,430	Tourism Marketing - Welcome Centers
Firstline Supervisors of Landscaping, Lawn Service, and Groundskeeping Workers	$39,230	State Parks - Field, Tourism Marketing - Welcome Centers
Concierges	$25,390	Tourism Marketing - Welcome Centers
Information Clerks	$32,050	Tourism Marketing - Welcome Centers
Hotel, Motel, Resort Desk Clerks	$19,620	Tourism Marketing - Welcome Centers, State Parks - Field (Limited)
Public Relations and Fundraising Managers	$72,050	Tourism Marketing, State Parks - CO

Data Source: SCDEW Website (jobs.scworks.org)

Appendix 3: State Parks Revenue & Expenses, FY 14 – 16, By Location

Park	FY 2014 Expenses	FY 2014 Revenue	FY 2015 Expenses	FY 2015 Revenue	FY 2016 Expenses	FY 2016 Revenue
Aiken State Park	$125,873	$57,576	$123,093	$67,356	$130,636	$73,625
Andrew Jackson State Park	$207,458	$97,941	$210,635	$109,503	$204,140	$117,752
Baker Creek State Park	$47,891	$47,825	$64,391	$49,181	$73,374	$49,840
Barnwell State Park	$189,345	$117,872	$193,538	$123,300	$215,387	$128,242
Calhoun Falls State Park	$547,604	$404,145	$559,579	$448,387	$558,050	$465,485
Charles Towne Landing State Historic Site	$1,396,247	$1,244,105	$1,599,784	$1,440,484	$1,508,995	$1,465,940
Cheraw State Park	$1,336,353	$675,562	$1,270,096	$687,430	$1,240,968	$796,984
Chester State Park	$140,667	$83,737	$149,996	$88,475	$143,713	$102,439
Colleton State Park	$162,418	$60,321	$156,616	$72,765	$153,908	$87,120
Colonial Dorchester State Historic Site	$111,942	$17,028	$129,726	$23,057	$146,958	$23,823
Croft State Park	$265,483	$189,321	$279,646	$220,605	$301,805	$256,961
Devils Fork State Park	$797,280	$1,058,430	$848,954	$1,255,529	$891,957	$1,510,716
Dreher Island State Park	$828,168	$934,525	$845,436	$1,042,771	$903,086	$1,009,508
Edisto Beach State Park	$863,292	$1,378,616	$899,708	$1,734,766	$927,647	$1,720,754
Givhans Ferry State Park	$194,600	$165,542	$205,217	$214,251	$234,847	$244,384
Goodale State Park	$27,379	$10,689	$30,418	$14,230	$29,229	$13,003
H. Cooper Black State Field Trial Area	$205,557	$104,652	$213,256	$139,393	$224,525	$165,861
Hamilton Branch State Park	$221,251	$250,598	$263,550	$321,182	$325,549	$364,702
Hampton Plantation State Historic Site	$171,426	$31,970	$176,138	$30,272	$188,602	$47,172
Hickory Knob State Resort Park	$2,762,424	$1,937,591	$2,794,908	$1,936,271	$2,791,648	$1,936,043
Hunting Island State Park	$1,928,858	$3,435,185	$2,096,757	$3,859,440	$2,130,549	$3,307,825
Huntington Beach State Park	$2,102,599	$2,491,785	$2,140,450	$2,934,980	$2,255,111	$3,022,202
Keowee Toxaway State Park	$175,675	$78,941	$153,882	$87,547	$155,506	$90,832
Kings Mountain State Park	$533,613	$351,953	$517,648	$366,682	$536,137	$401,295
Lake Greenwood State Park	$450,101	$369,445	$452,743	$331,783	$467,498	$510,680
Lake Hartwell State Park	$229,222	$142,284	$234,777	$167,603	$234,343	$199,639
Lake Warren State Park	$107,545	$15,625	$110,763	$14,668	$104,073	$18,306
Lake Wateree State Park	$430,152	$502,893	$404,323	$501,812	$411,788	$506,426
Landsford Canal State Park	$120,763	$51,979	$118,727	$57,080	$117,399	$59,572
Lee State Park	$220,794	$46,673	$229,816	$45,433	$233,278	$57,027
Little Pee Dee State Park	$132,169	$58,824	$133,040	$60,097	$152,539	$84,574
Mountain Bridge Wilderness Area	$531,242	$252,546	$593,358	$282,967	$600,250	$342,895
Musgrove Mill State Historic Site	$145,469	$9,420	$138,287	$11,883	$158,174	$13,856
Myrtle Beach State Park	$1,662,497	$3,295,400	$1,841,053	$3,608,665	$1,984,058	$3,833,433
Oconee State Park	$762,109	$690,568	$758,000	$712,189	$776,371	$733,970

Oconee Station State Historic Site	$58,960	$506	$58,434	$128	$58,721	$158
Paris Mountain State Park	$440,118	$465,314	$452,001	$529,898	$456,995	$716,695
Poinsett State Park	$211,102	$119,250	$203,306	$153,061	$225,228	$184,500
Redcliffe State Historic Site	$149,556	$20,641	$155,275	$26,331	$166,703	$28,936
Rivers Bridge State Historic Site	$98,738	$4,677	$109,339	$7,512	$102,449	$10,043
Rose Hill Plantation State Historic Site	$120,059	$12,625	$122,417	$11,257	$126,323	$14,624
Sadlers Creek State Park	$210,777	$122,469	$208,759	$138,122	$215,175	$153,470
Santee State Park	$904,281	$941,067	$930,351	$1,055,622	$935,140	$983,254
Sesquicentennial State Park	$444,919	$373,342	$464,892	$425,937	$531,013	$489,459
Table Rock State Park	$879,553	$989,010	$951,464	$1,120,717	$1,015,789	$1,294,360
Woods Bay State Park	$44,611	$456	$44,397	$632	$43,974	$496
State House Tours and Gift Shop	$272,721	$162,574	$298,826	$198,925	$293,120	$196,498
SPS Other Expenses	$3,756,820	$165,898	$3,629,406	$176,474	$3,615,714	$218,335
Totals	**$27,727,683**	**$24,039,397**	**$28,567,177**	**$26,906,654**	**$29,298,442**	**$28,053,715**

Data Source: SCPRT